

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 13, 16, 19, and 20-28 are pending in the application, of which claims 13, 16, 22, 24, and 27 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 13, 16, and 19 are sought to be amended. Claims 20-28 are sought to be added. Claims 1-12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are sought to be cancelled. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1, 5, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,854,841 to Nakata *et al.* (hereinafter "Nakata"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

To anticipate a claim of a pending application, a single reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1397 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The exclusion of a claimed element from the single source is enough to negate anticipation by that reference. *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Applicants have cancelled claims 1 and 5, and the claims that depend therefrom. Thus, it is believed that the foregoing Amendment renders the rejection of claims 1 and 5

moot. With regards to claim 16, Nakata does not teach or suggest every element of Applicants' claimed invention. For example, Nakata does not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed element of: in response to the closing of the socket, terminating a correlation of the security association with the socket, wherein the correlation of the security association with the socket is terminated by determining whether any other socket is correlated with the security association, and if it is determined that no other socket is correlated with the security association, deleting the security association. Applicants' new independent claims 22 and 24 recite similar elements to the elements of claim 16.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 16, 22, and 24 are not anticipated by Nakata. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 16.

The Examiner, on page 3 of the Office Action has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,519,636 to Engel *et al.* (hereinafter "Engel"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicants have cancelled claims 1-12. Thus, it is believed that the foregoing Amendment renders the rejection of claims 1-12 moot. With respect to independent claims 13 and 16, Engel does not teach or suggest every element of Applicants' claimed invention. For example, referring to independent claim 13, Engel does not teach Applicants' claimed element of: a network interceptor coupling the client processor with the transmission control protocol, and responsive to the socket being closed for deleting

the security association, wherein the network interceptor responds to the socket being closed by determining whether any other socket is correlated with the security association, and if it is determined that no other socket is correlated with the security association, deleting the security association.

Contrary to the present invention, Engel appears to teach a delete rule trigger event. *Engel*, col. 14, lines 29-30. The delete rule trigger event contains the flow parameters that uniquely identify the rule that is to be deleted. *Id* at lines 30-31. If the rule is successfully located in the rule database, it is disassociated from all sockets and removed from the database. *Id* at lines 31-37. Thus, unlike the present invention, which teaches that the network interceptor responds to the socket being closed by determining whether any other socket is correlated with the security association, and if it is determined that no other socket is correlated with the security association, deleting the security association, Engel teaches if the rule is located in the rule database, disassociating the rule from *all sockets* and removing the rule from the database. Applicants' new independent claim 27 recites similar elements to the elements of claim 13. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13, and 27, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Engel. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 13, and the claims that depend therefrom.

Referring to claim 16, Engel does not teach Applicants' claimed element of: in response to closing of the socket, terminating a correlation of the security association with the socket, wherein the correlation of the security association with the socket is terminated by determining whether any other socket is correlated with the security

association, and if it is determined that no other socket is correlated with the security association, deleting the security association. Instead, Engel teaches if the rule is located in the rule database, disassociating the rule from *all sockets* and removing the rule from the database. Applicants' new independent claims 22 and 24 recite similar elements to the elements of claim 16. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16, 22, and 24, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Engel. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 16, and the claims that depend therefrom.

New Claims

New claims 20-28 have been added. Claims 20 and 21 depend from independent claim 13, and thus, are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons stated above. Independent claims 22 and 24 provide for terminating a correlation of the security association with the socket, wherein the correlation of the security association with the socket is terminated by determining whether any other socket is correlated with the security association, and if it is determined that no other socket is correlated with the security association, deleting the security association. Neither Nakata nor Engel, individually or in combination, teach or suggest this feature. Applicants therefore assert that claims 22 and 24, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Nakata or Engel. Independent claim 27 includes a network interceptor, wherein the network interceptor responds to the socket being closed by determining whether any other socket is correlated with the security association, and if it is determined that no other socket is correlated with the security association, to delete the security association.

Again, neither Nakata nor Engel, individually or in combination, teach or suggest this feature. Applicants therefore assert that independent claim 27 and dependent claim 28 are not anticipated by Nakata or Engel.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Crystal D. Sayles

Crystal D. Sayles
Senior Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
Registration No. 44,318
(703) 633-6829

Dated: *April 15, 2004*

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

4-15-04

Date of Deposit

David S. Walton

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

DS
Signature

4-15-04
Date